

PCF WITHOUT CHOICE

SAHARON SHELAH

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Einstein Institute of Mathematics
Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram
Jerusalem 91904, Israel

Department of Mathematics
Hill Center-Busch Campus
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
110 Frelinghuysen Road
Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

ABSTRACT. We mainly investigate model of set theory with restricted choice, e.g., $\text{ZF} + \text{DC} +$ the family of countable subsets of λ is well ordered for every λ (really local version for a given λ). In this frame much of pcf theory (and combinatorial set theory in general) can be generalized. E.g., there is a class of regular cardinals, successor cardinals are not measurable and we can prove cardinal inequalities.

This research was supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation. Publication 835

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}\text{-}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{X}$

ANNOTATED CONTENT

§0 Introduction

[Include quoting [Sh 497], (0.1,0.2), $\theta(Y)$, $\Upsilon(Y)$ (0.3) defining $\text{rk}_D(f)$ (0.4 + 0.5 on $J[f, D]$ (0.6, 0.4, 0.8) $\mathcal{H}_{<\kappa, \gamma}$ (0.9) and observation 0.10) define ι -normal filters (0.11) and closure operation (0.12).

§1 Representing ${}^\kappa\lambda$

[We define $\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^\ell$ and prove a representation of ${}^\kappa\lambda$. Essentially under “reasonable choice” the set ${}^\kappa\lambda$ is the union of few well ordered set, i.e., their number depends on κ only.]

§2 No decreasing sequence of subalgebras

[As suggested in the title we weaken the axioms. We deal with ${}^\kappa\lambda, \lambda^+$ not measurable, existence of $\bar{C}$ and prove that many λ^+ are regular (2.13).]

§0 INTRODUCTION

The thesis of [Sh 497] was that pcf theory without full choice exists. Two theorems supporting this thesis were proved. The first ([Sh 497, 4.6,pg.117]).

0.1 Theorem. [DC] *If $\mathcal{H}(\mu)$ is well ordered, μ strong limit singular of uncountable cofinality then μ^+ is regular not measurable (and 2^μ is an $\aleph$ and no $\lambda \in (\mu, 2^\mu]$ is measurable).*

Note that before this Apter and Magidor [ApMg95] has proved the consistency of “ $\mathcal{H}(\mu)$ well ordered, $\mu = \beth_\omega$, $(\forall \kappa < \mu) \text{DC}_\kappa$ and μ^+ is measurable” so 0.1 says that this consistency result cannot be fully lifted to uncountable cofinalities. Generally without full choice, a successor cardinal being not measurable is worthwhile information.

A second theorem ([Sh 497, §5]) was

0.2 Theorem. *Assume*

- (a) $\text{DC} + \text{AC}_\kappa + \kappa$ regular uncountable
- (b) $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is increasing continuous with limit μ , $\mu > \kappa$ strong limit (we need just a somewhat weaker version, the so-called $i < \kappa \Rightarrow \text{Tw}_{\mathcal{D}_\kappa}(\mu_i) < \mu$).

Then we cannot have two regular cardinals θ such that for some stationary $S \subseteq \kappa$, the sequence $\langle \text{cf}(\mu_i^+) : i \in S \rangle$ is constant.

A dream was to prove there is a class of regular cardinals from a restricted version of choice (see more [Sh 497]) and a little more in [Sh:E37]).

Our original aim here is to improve those theorems. As for 0.1 we replace “ $\mathcal{H}(\mu)$ well ordered” by “ $[\mu]^{\aleph_0}$ is well ordered” and then by weaker statements.

We know that if, e.g., $\neg \exists 0^\#$ or no inner model with a measurable then though $\langle 2^\kappa : \kappa \text{ regular} \rangle$ is quite arbitrary, the size of $[\lambda]^\kappa$, $\lambda \gg \kappa$ is strictly controlled (by Easton forcing [ES], and Jensen and Dood [DJ2]). It seemed that the situation here is parallel in some sense; under the restricted choice we assume, we cannot say much on the cardinality of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ but can say something on the cardinality of $[\lambda]^\kappa$ for $\lambda \gg \kappa$.

In the proofs we fulfill a promise from [Sh 589, §5] about using $J[f, D]$ from Definition 0.7 instead of the nice filters used in [Sh 497] and, to some extent, in early versions of this work. This will be continued in [Sh:F725] (i.e., not so finished parts have been delayed to it); it deals with cardinal inequalities and eub’s.

In [Sh:F728] we try to generalize [Sh 460] - using “little choice”. The present work fits the thesis of [Sh:g] which is better to look at $\langle \lambda^{\aleph_0} : \lambda \rangle$ then at $\langle 2^\lambda : \lambda \rangle$. Here instead well ordering $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ we well order $[\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ this is enough for much.

We thank for attention and comments the audience in the advanced seminar in Rutgers 10/2004 (particularly Arthur Apter) and advanced course in logic in the Hebrew University 4,5/2005.

0.3 Definition. 1) $\theta(A) = \text{Min}\{\alpha: \text{there is no function from } A \text{ onto } \alpha\}$.
2) $\Upsilon(A) = \text{Min}\{\alpha: \text{there is no one-to-one function from } \alpha \text{ into } A\}$.

0.4 Definition. 1) For D an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on Y and $f \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$ and $\alpha \in \text{Ord} \cup \{\infty\}$ we define when $\text{rk}_D(f) = \alpha$:

⊗ For $\alpha < \infty$, $\text{rk}_D(f) = \alpha$ iff $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow \text{rk}_D(f) \neq \beta$ and for every $g \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$ satisfying $g <_D f$ there is $\beta < \alpha$ such that $\text{rk}_D(g) = \beta$.

2) We can replace D by the dual ideal.

Galvin and Hajnal [GH75] use the club filter on ω_1 . This was continued in [Sh 71] where varying D was extensively used.

0.5 Claim. [DC] In 0.4, $\text{rk}_D(f)$ is always an ordinal and if $\alpha \leq \text{rk}_D(f)$ then for some $g \in \prod_{y \in Y} (f(y) + 1)$ we have $\alpha = \text{rk}_D(g)$ (if $\alpha < \text{rk}_D(f)$ we can add $g <_D f$).

0.6 Claim. [DC] If D is an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on Y and $f \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$ and $Y = \cup\{Y_n : n < \omega\}$ then $\text{rk}_D(f) = \text{Min}\{\text{rk}_{D+Y_n}(f) : Y_n \in D^+\}$ ([Sh 71]).

0.7 Definition. For Y, D, f in 0.4 let $J[f, D] =: \{Z \subseteq Y : Y \setminus Z \in D \text{ or } \text{rk}(f)_{D+(Y \setminus Z)} > \text{rk}_D(f)\}$.

0.8 Claim. [DC+AC $_{<\kappa}$] Assume D is a κ -complete filter on Y , $\kappa > \aleph_0$.

- 1) If $f \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$ then $J[f, D]$ is a κ -complete ideal on Y .
- 2) If $f_1, f_2 \in {}^Y\text{Ord}$ and $J = J[f_1, D] = J[f_2, D]$ then $\text{rk}_D(f_1) = \text{rk}_D(f_2) \Rightarrow f_1 < f_2 \text{ mod } J$ and $\text{rk}_D(f_1) = \text{rk}_D(f_2) \Rightarrow f_1 = f_2 \text{ mod } J$.

Proof. See [Sh 589, §5] - the reference there to [Sh 497] (and [Sh 71]).

0.9 Definition. For a set Y , cardinal κ and ordinal γ we define $\mathcal{H}_{<\kappa,\gamma}(Y)$ by induction on γ : if $\gamma = 0$, $\mathcal{H}_{<\kappa,\gamma}(Y) = Y$, if $\gamma = \beta + 1$ then $\mathcal{H}_{<\kappa,\gamma}(Y) = \mathcal{H}_{<\kappa,\beta}(Y) \cup \{u : u \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{<\kappa,\beta}(Y) \text{ and } |u| < \kappa\}$ and if γ is a limit ordinal then $\mathcal{H}_{<\kappa,\gamma}(Y) = \cup\{\mathcal{H}_{<\kappa,\beta}(Y) : \beta < \gamma\}$.

0.10 Observation. 1) If λ is the disjoint union of $\langle W_z : z \in Z \rangle$ and $z \in Z \Rightarrow |W_z| < \lambda$ and $\Upsilon(Z) \leq \lambda$ then $\lambda = \sup\{\text{otp}(W_z) : z \in Z\}$ hence $\text{cf}(\lambda) < \theta(Z)$.
2) If $\lambda = \cup\{W_z : z \in Z\}$ and $\Upsilon(\mathcal{P}(Z)) \leq \lambda$ then $\sup\{\text{otp}(W_z) : z \in Z\} = \lambda$.

Proof. 1) Let $Z_1 = \{z \in Z : W_z \neq \emptyset\}$, so the mapping $z \mapsto \text{Min}(W_z)$ exemplifies that Z_1 is well ordered hence by the definition of $\Upsilon(Z_1)$ the power $|Z_1|$ is an aleph $< \Upsilon(Z_1) \leq \Upsilon(Z)$ and by assumption $\Upsilon(Z) \leq \lambda$. Now if the conclusion fail then $\gamma^* = \sup(\{\text{otp}(W_z) : z \in Z_1\} \cup \{|Z_1|\})$ is an ordinal $< \lambda$, so we can find a sequence $\langle u_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma^* \rangle$ such that $\text{otp}(u_\gamma) \leq \gamma^*$, $u_\gamma \subseteq \lambda$ and $\lambda = \cup\{u_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma^*\}$, so $\gamma^* < \lambda \leq |\gamma^* \times \gamma^*|$, easy contradiction.
2) For $x \subseteq Y$ let $W_x^* = \{\alpha < \lambda : (\forall z \in Z)(\alpha \in W_z \equiv \alpha \in x)\}$ hence λ is the disjoint union of $\{W_x^* : x \in \mathcal{P}(Y)\}$. So the result follows by (1). $\square_{0.10}$

A form of being a normal filter is

0.11 Definition. Assume that

- ⊗ (a) κ is a regular uncountable cardinal
- (b) $\mathcal{Y}$ is a set
- (c) $\iota : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \kappa$ is onto κ (or just some club of κ is included in the range).

Let $\text{NFil}(\mathcal{Y}, \iota)$ be the family of ι -normal filters, that is, filters D on $\mathcal{Y}$ such that

- (α) $\alpha < \kappa \Rightarrow \{y \in \mathcal{Y} : \iota(y) \geq \alpha\} \in D$
- (β) [normality] if $Z_\alpha \in D$ for $\alpha < \kappa$ then $\Delta_{\alpha < \kappa} Z_\alpha =: \{y \in \mathcal{Y} : y \in \{Z_\beta : \beta < \iota(y)\}\}$ belongs to D .

0.12 Definition. 1) We say that $c\ell$ is a very weak closure operation on λ of character (μ, κ) when:

- (a) $c\ell$ is a function from $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ to $\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$
- (b) $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \kappa} \Rightarrow |c\ell(u)| \leq \mu$
- (c) $u \subseteq \lambda \Rightarrow u \cup \{0\} \subseteq c\ell(u)$, the 0 for technical reason.

1A) We say that cl is a weak closure operation on λ of character (μ, κ) when (a),(b),(c) above and

- (d) $u \subseteq v \subseteq \lambda \Rightarrow u \subseteq cl(u) \subseteq cl(v)$
- (e) $cl(u) = \cup \{cl(v) : v \subseteq u, |v| \leq \kappa\}$.

1B) Let “... character $(< \mu, \kappa)$ ” has the obvious meaning

“... character (μ, Y) ” means “character $(< \mu^+, < \theta(Y))$ ”

1C) We omit the weak if in addition

- (f) $cl(u) = cl(cl(u))$ for $u \subseteq \lambda$.

2) λ is f -inaccessible when $\delta \in \lambda \cap \text{Dom}(f) \Rightarrow f(\delta) < \lambda$.

3) $cl : \mathcal{P}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ is well founded when for no sequence $\langle \mathcal{U}_n : n < \omega \rangle$ of subsets of λ do we have $cl(\mathcal{U}_{n+1}) \subset \mathcal{U}_n$ for $n < \omega$.

4) For cl a partial function from $\mathcal{P}(\alpha)$ to $\mathcal{P}(\alpha)$ (for simplicity assume $\alpha = \cup \{u : u \in \text{Dom}(cl)\}$) let $cl_{<\kappa}^{[\varepsilon]} = cl_{[\varepsilon], <\kappa}$ a function from $\mathcal{P}(\alpha)$ to $\mathcal{P}(\alpha)$ be defined by induction on the ordinal ε as follows: $cl_{<\kappa}^{[0]}(u) = u, cl_{<\kappa}^{[\varepsilon+1]}(u) = u \cup \bigcup \{cl(v) : v \subseteq cl_{<\kappa}^{[\varepsilon]}(u) \text{ and } v \in \text{Dom}(cl)\}$ and for limit ε let $cl_{<\kappa}^{[\varepsilon]}(u) = \cup \{cl_{<\kappa}^{[\zeta]}(u) : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$.

5) For any function $F : [\lambda]^{\aleph_0} \rightarrow \lambda$ let $cl_*(u, F)$ be defined as $cl_*^{\omega_1}(u, F)$ where for $\varepsilon \leq \omega_1$ and countable $u \subseteq \lambda$ we define $cl_*^\varepsilon(u, F)$ by induction on ε

$$cl_*^0(u, F) = u$$

$$cl_*^{\varepsilon+1}(u, F) = cl_*^\varepsilon(u, F) \cup \{F(u)\}$$

$$cl_*^\varepsilon(u, F) = \cup \{cl_*^\zeta(u, F) : \zeta < \varepsilon\} \text{ when } \varepsilon < \omega_1 \text{ is a limit ordinal.}$$

6) $cl_*(u, F) = cl_*^{\omega_1}(u, F)$ and $cl_{*,F}(u) = cl_*(u, F)$.

7) For a cardinal ∂ we say that $cl : \mathcal{P}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ is ∂ -well founded when for no $\subseteq$ -decreasing sequence $\langle \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ of subsets of λ do we have $\varepsilon < \zeta < \partial \Rightarrow cl(\mathcal{U}_\zeta) \not\subseteq \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$.

0.13 Remark. So $\aleph_0$ -well founded is a stronger property than well founded, but if $u \subseteq \lambda \Rightarrow cl(cl(u)) = cl(u)$ which is reasonable, they are equivalent.

0.14 Observation. $[\alpha]^\partial$ is well ordered iff ${}^\partial\alpha$ is well ordered when $\alpha \geq \partial$.

§1 REPRESENTING ${}^\kappa\lambda$

Here we give a simple case to illustrate what we do (see the latter on improvements in the hypothesis and conclusion). Specifically, if Y is uncountable, for any λ such that $[\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ is well ordered, then the set ${}^Y\lambda$ can be an analysis modulo countable union over few (i.e., their number depends on Y but not on λ) well ordered sets.

1.1 Definition. 1)

- (a) $\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}(Y) = \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^1(Y) = \{D : D \text{ an } \aleph_1\text{-complete filter on } Y\}$,
- (b) $\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^2(Y) = \{(D_1, D_2) : D_1 \subseteq D_2 \text{ are } \aleph_1\text{-complete filters on } Y, (\emptyset \notin D_2, \text{ of course})\}$; in this context $Z \in \bar{D}$ means $Z \in D_2$
- (c) $\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^3(Y, \mu) = \{(D_1, D_2, h) : (D_1, D_2) \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^2(Y) \text{ and } h : Y \rightarrow \mu\}$, if we omit μ we mean $\mu = \theta(\mathcal{H}_{<\aleph_1, \aleph_1}(\mathcal{A}_\omega(Y)))$ where we let $\mathcal{A}_\omega(Y)$ be the free $\{F\}$ -algebra generated by Y , (F an ω -place function symbol),
- (d) $\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y, \mu) = \{(D_1, D_2, h, Z) : (D_1, D_2, h) \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^3(Y, \mu), Z \in D_2\}$; omitting μ means as above.

- 2) For $\mathfrak{y} \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y, \mu)$ let $Y = Y^\mathfrak{y}$, $\mathfrak{y} = (D_1^\mathfrak{y}, D_2^\mathfrak{y}, h^\mathfrak{y}, Z^\mathfrak{y}) = (D_1[\mathfrak{y}], D_2[\mathfrak{y}], h[\mathfrak{y}], Z[\mathfrak{y}])$; similarly for the others.
- 3) We can replace $\aleph_1$ by any $\kappa > \aleph_1$ (the results can be generalized easily).

1.2 Theorem. $[\text{DC}_{\aleph_0}]$ Assume

- (a) $[\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ is well ordered
- (b) Y is an uncountable set.

Then we can find a sequence $\langle \mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{y} : \mathfrak{y} \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y) \rangle$ satisfying

- (α) $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{y}$ is a well ordered set
- (β) $\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{y} \subseteq {}^{Z^\mathfrak{y}}\lambda$
- (γ) if $f \in {}^Y\lambda$ then we can find $\langle (\mathfrak{y}_n : n < \omega) \rangle$ with $\mathfrak{y}_n \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)$ such that $n < \omega \Rightarrow f \upharpoonright Z^{\mathfrak{y}_n} \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{y}_n}$ and $\cup\{Z^{\mathfrak{y}_n} : n < \omega\} = Y$.

An immediate consequence of 1.2 is

1.3 Conclusion. 1) $[\text{DC} + {}^\omega\alpha \text{ is well-orderable for every ordinal } \alpha]$.

For any set Y and cardinal λ there is a sequence $\langle (\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} : \bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y))) \rangle$ such that

- (a) ${}^Y\lambda = \cup\{\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} : \bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y))\}$
 - (b) $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$ is well orderable for each $\bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y))$
 - (b)⁺ moreover, uniformly, i.e., there is a sequence $\langle <_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} : \bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)) \rangle$ such that $<_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$ is a well order of $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$
 - (c) there is a function F with domain $\mathcal{P}({}^Y\alpha) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ such that: if $S \subseteq {}^Y\alpha$, $F(S)$ is a non-empty subset of u of cardinality $< \theta({}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)))$.
- 2) [DC] If $[\alpha(*)]^{\aleph_0}$ is well ordered where $\alpha(*) = \cup\{\text{rk}_D(f) + 1 : f \in {}^Y\lambda \text{ and } D \in \text{FIL}_{\aleph_1}^1(Y)\}$ then $Y_{\alpha(*)}$ satisfies the conclusion of part (a).

Proof of 1.3. 1) Let $\langle \mathcal{F}_{\bar{\mathfrak{y}}} : \bar{\mathfrak{y}} \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y) \rangle$ be as in 1.2.

For each $\bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y))$ (so $\bar{\mathfrak{x}} = \langle \mathfrak{x}_n : n < \omega \rangle$) let

$$\mathcal{F}'_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} = \{f : f \text{ is a function from } Y \text{ to } \lambda \text{ such that} \\ n < \omega \Rightarrow f \upharpoonright Z^{\mathfrak{x}_n} \text{ and } Y = \cup\{Z^{\mathfrak{x}_n} : n < \omega\}\}.$$

Now

$$(*)_1 \quad {}^Y\lambda = \cup\{\mathcal{F}'_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} : \bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y))\}.$$

[Why? By clause (γ) of 1.2.]

Let $\alpha(*) = \cup\{\text{rk}_D(f) + 1 : f \in {}^Y\lambda \text{ and } D \in F_{\aleph_1}^1(Y)\}$. For $\bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y))$ we define the¹ function $G_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} : \mathcal{F}'_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} \rightarrow {}^\omega\alpha(*)$ by $G_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}(f) = \langle \text{rk}_{D_1[\mathfrak{x}_n]}(f) : n < \omega \rangle$.

Clearly

- (*)₂ (α) $\bar{G} = \langle G_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} : \bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)) \rangle$ exists
- (β) $G_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$ is a function from $\mathcal{F}'_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$ to ${}^\omega\alpha(*)$
- (γ) $G_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$ is one to one.

Let $<_*$ be a well ordering of ${}^\omega\alpha(*)$ and for $\bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y))$ let $<_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$ be the following two place relation on $\mathcal{F}'_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$:

$$(*)_3 \quad f_1 <_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} f_2 \text{ iff } G_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}(f_1) <_* G_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}(f_2).$$

Obviously

- (*)₄ (α) $\langle <_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}} : \bar{\mathfrak{x}} \in {}^\omega(\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)) \rangle$ exists
- (β) $<_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$ is a well ordering of $\mathcal{F}'_{\bar{\mathfrak{x}}}$.

¹we could have fixed $D_1^{\mathfrak{x}_1}$ as D

By $(*)_1 + (*)_4$ we are done.

2) Similarly.

□_{1.3}

Proof of 1.2. First

- ⊗₁ there is $\bar{u} = \langle u_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ listing $[\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$
[why? by assumption (a).]

Second, we can deduce

- ⊗₂ there are $\mu_1 \leq \mu$ and a sequence $\bar{u} = \langle u_\alpha : \alpha < \mu_1 \rangle$ such that:
- (a) $u_\alpha \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$
 - (b) if $u \in [\lambda]^{\leq \aleph_0}$ then for some finite $w \subseteq \mu_1$, $u \subseteq \cup\{u_\beta : \beta \in w\}$
 - (c) u_α is not included in $u_{\alpha_0} \cup \dots \cup u_{\alpha_{n-1}}$ when $n < \omega$, $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{n-1} < \alpha$.
- [Why? Let $\bar{u}^0$ be of the form $\langle u_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ such that (a) + (b) holds and $\ell g(\bar{u}^0)$ is minimal; it is well defined and $\ell g(\bar{u}^0) \leq \mu$ by ⊗₁. Let $W = \{\alpha < \ell g(\bar{u}^0) : u_\alpha^0 \not\subseteq \cup\{u_\beta^0 : \beta \in w\} \text{ when } w \subseteq \alpha \text{ is finite}\}$. Let $\mu_1 = |W|$ and let $f : \mu_1 \rightarrow W$ be a one-to-one onto, let $u_\alpha = u_{f(\alpha)}^0$ so $\langle u_\alpha : \alpha < \mu_1 \rangle$ satisfies (a) + (b) and $\mu_1 = |W| \leq \ell g(\bar{u}^0)$. So by the choice of $\bar{u}^0$ we have $\ell g(\bar{u}^0) = \mu_1$ and we can choose f such that it is increasing so $\bar{u}$ is as required.]
- ⊗₃ we can define $\mathbf{n} : [\lambda]^{\leq \aleph_0} \rightarrow \omega$ and $F_\ell : [\lambda]^{\leq \aleph_0} \rightarrow \mu_1$ for $\ell < \omega$ as follows:
- u infinite $\Rightarrow F_0(u) = \text{Min}\{\alpha : \text{for some finite } w \subseteq \alpha, u \subseteq u_\alpha \cup \cup\{u_\beta : \beta \in w\} \text{ mod finite}\}$
 - u finite - $F_0(u)$ undefined

$$F_{\ell+1}(u) = F_0(u \setminus (u_{F_0(u)} \cup \dots \cup u_{F_\ell(u)}))$$

$$\mathbf{n}(u) = \text{Min}\{\ell : F_\ell(u) \text{ undefined}\}$$

Then

- ⊗₄ $\mathbf{n}(u)$ is well defined and $u \setminus \cup\{u_{F_\ell(u)} : \ell < \mathbf{n}(u)\}$ is finite and $k < \mathbf{n}(u) \Rightarrow (u \setminus \cup\{u_{F_\ell(u)} : \ell < k\}) \cap u_{F_k(u)}$ is infinite
- ⊗₅ define $F_* : [\lambda]^{\aleph_0} \rightarrow \lambda$ by $F_*(u) = \text{Min}(\cup\{u_{F_\ell(u)} : \ell < \mathbf{n}(u)\} \cup \{0\} \setminus u)$ if well defined, zero otherwise
- ⊗₆ if $u \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ then $cl_*(u, F_*)$ is $F'(u) =: u \cup \cup\{u_{F_\ell(u)} : \ell < \mathbf{n}(u)\} \cup \{0\}$.
[Why? Define w_u^ε by induction on ε by $w_u^0 = u$, $w_u^{\varepsilon+1} = w_u^\varepsilon \cup \{F_*(w_u^\varepsilon)\}$ and for limit ε , $w_u^\varepsilon = \cup\{w_u^\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$. We can prove by induction on ε that $w_u^\varepsilon \subseteq F'(u)$ which is countable. The partial function g with domain

$F'(u) \setminus u$ to Ord, $g(\alpha) = \text{Min}\{\varepsilon : \alpha \in w_u^{\varepsilon+1}\}$ is one to one onto an ordinal call it $\varepsilon(*)$, so $w_u^{\varepsilon(*)} = F'(u)$.]

⊗₇ there is no sequence $\langle \mathcal{U}_n : n < \omega \rangle$ such that

- (a) $\mathcal{U}_{n+1} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_n \subset \lambda$
- (b) $\mathcal{U}_n$ is closed under F_*
- (c) $\mathcal{U}_{n+1} \neq \mathcal{U}_n$
 [Why? Let $\alpha_n = \text{Min}(\mathcal{U}_n \setminus \mathcal{U}_{n+1})$ so $\langle F_\ell(\{\alpha_n : n \geq m\}) : \ell \leq (\mathbf{n}(\{\alpha_n : n \in [m, \omega)\})) \rangle$ is the same for every m large enough hence for every n large enough $\alpha_n \in cl_{*,F_*}(\{\alpha_n : n > m\}) \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{m+1}$, contradiction.]

Let $u_n = \{\alpha_n : n = m, m+1, \dots\}$. Now we define for $(D_1, D_2, h, Z) \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)$:

- ⊗₈ $\mathcal{F}_{(D_1, D_2, h, Z), \alpha} = \{f : (a) \text{ } f \text{ is a function from } Z \text{ to } \lambda$
 (b) $\text{rk}_{D_1}(f \cup 0_{(Y \setminus Z)}) = \alpha$
 (c) $D_2 = \{Y \setminus X : X \subseteq Y \text{ satisfies } X = \emptyset \text{ mod } D_1$
 or $X \in D_1^+ \text{ and } (\text{rk}_{D_1}(f \cup 0_{(Y \setminus Z)}) > \alpha\}$
 (d) if $Z' \subseteq Z \wedge Z' \in D_2$ then
 $cl_{F_*}(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright Z')) = cl_{F_*}(\text{Rang}(f))$
 (e) $y \in Z \Rightarrow f(y) = \text{the } h(z)\text{-th member of } cl_{*,F_*}(\text{Rang}(f))\}$.

So by ⊗₇ we have

- ⊗₉ $\mathcal{F}_{(D_1, D_2, h, Z), \alpha}$ has at most one member called it $f_{(D_1, D_2, h, Z), \alpha}$ (we should write $f_{(D_1, D_2, h, Z), cl, \alpha}$)
- ⊗₁₀ $\mathcal{F}_{(D_1, D_2, h, Z)} =: \cup \{\mathcal{F}_{(D_1, D_2, h, Z), \alpha} : \alpha \text{ an ordinal}\}$ is a well ordered set
- ⊗₁₁ if $f : Y \rightarrow \lambda$ and $Z \subseteq Y$ then $cl_{*,F_*}(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright Z))$ has cardinality $< \theta(\mathcal{H}_{<\aleph_1, \aleph_1}(Y))$
 [Why? Let $\mathcal{H}_0 = Y$, $\mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon+1} = \{u : u \text{ a countable subset of } \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon \text{ or } u \in \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon\}$, $\mathcal{H}_\delta = \cup \{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \delta\}$, so $\mathcal{H}_{<\aleph_1, \aleph_1}(Y) = \cup \{\mathcal{H}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\}$ and we choose $g_\varepsilon : \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon \rightarrow cl_{*,F_*}(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright Z))$ which is increasing continuous by induction on $\varepsilon \leq \omega_1$ as follows $g_\varepsilon(y) = f(y)$ for $y \in Z$, zero otherwise, $g_{\varepsilon+1}(u) = F_*(\{g_\varepsilon(v) : v \in u\})$ for $u \in \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon+1} \setminus \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon$. Recalling that we are assuming DC, clearly $\aleph_1$ is regular, g_{ω_1} is a function from $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_1} = \mathcal{H}_{<\aleph_1, \aleph_1}(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright Z))$ onto $cl_{*,F_*}(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright Z))$ so by the definition of $\theta(-)$ we are done.]
- ⊗₁₂ if $f : Y \rightarrow \lambda$ then for some $\eta_n \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)$ and $\alpha_n \in \text{Ord}$ for $n < \omega$ we have $f = \cup \{f_{\eta_n, \alpha_n} : n < \omega\}$
 [why? let

$$\mathcal{I}_f^0 = \{Z \subseteq Y : \text{for some } \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y) \text{ satisfying } Z^\eta = Z$$

and ordinal α , $f_{\eta, \alpha}$ is well defined and equal to $f \upharpoonright Z\}$

$\mathcal{I}_f = \{Z \subseteq Y : Z \text{ is included in a countable union of members of } \mathcal{I}_f^0\}.$

So it is enough to show that $Y \in \mathcal{I}_f$.

Toward contradiction assume not. Let $D_1 = \{Y \setminus Z : Z \in \mathcal{I}_f\}$, clearly it belongs to $\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}(Y)$. So $\alpha(*) = \text{rk}_{D_1}(f)$ is well defined (by 0.5) recalling that only $\text{DC}_{\aleph_0}$ is needed.

Let

$$D_2 = \{X \subseteq Y : X \in D_1 \text{ or } \text{rk}(f)_{D_1+(Y \setminus X)}(f) > \alpha(*)\}.$$

By 0.7 + 0.8 D_2 is an $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on Y extending D_1 .

Now we try to choose $Z_n \in D_2$ for $n < \omega$ such that $Z_{n+1} \subseteq Z_n$ and $\text{cl}_{F_*}(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright Z_{n+1}))$ is a proper subset of $\text{cl}_{F_*}(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright Z_n))$, it is always a subset; this is possible by $\text{DC}_{\aleph_0}$.

For $n = 0$, $Z_0 = Y$ is O.K.

By $\otimes_7$ for some (unique) $n = n(*)$, Z_n is defined but not Z_{n+1} .

Let $h : Z_n \rightarrow \theta(\mathcal{H}_{\aleph_1}(Y \cup \omega_1))$ be:

$$h(y) = \text{otp}(f(y) \cap \text{cl}_{F_*}(\text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright Z_n))).$$

Now h is well defined by $\otimes_{11}$. Easily

$$f \upharpoonright Z_n \in \mathcal{F}_{(D_1+Z_n, D_2+Z_n, h, Z_n), \alpha(*)}$$

hence $Z_n \in \mathcal{I}_f^0 \subseteq \mathcal{I}_f$, contradiction to $Z_n \in D_2$.

So we are done proving $\otimes_{12}$.]

Now clause (β) of the conclusion holds by the definition of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathfrak{y}}$, clause (α) holds by $\otimes_{10}$ and clause (γ) holds by $\otimes_{12}$. $\square_{1.2}$

1.4 Remark. We can improve in some way the choice of $\bar{u}$

- (a) let $\langle u_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ be a sequence of members of $[\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ such that $(\forall u \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_0})(\exists \alpha)(u \cap u_\alpha \text{ infinite})$, we can replace u_α by $u'_\alpha = \{\beta \in u_\alpha : \beta \cap u_\alpha \text{ is finite}\}$, so without loss of generality $\text{otp}(u_\alpha) = \omega$. Now define $F_* : [\lambda]^{\aleph_0} \rightarrow \lambda$ by $F_*(u) = \min\{\beta \in u_{\alpha(v)} : \beta \cap u_{\alpha(v)} \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \beta \cap v = \emptyset\}$ where we define $\alpha(v) = \text{Min}\{\alpha < \alpha^* : v \cap u_\alpha \text{ infinite}\}$.

This works as well from weaker assumptions (see more later)

- (b) (α) there is $\langle h_\alpha : \alpha \in \alpha \in [\omega, \omega_1] \rangle$ such that h_α is one-to-one from α onto α or
- (β) just $[\omega_1]^{\aleph_0}$ is well ordered then we can define functions $\alpha_n : [\lambda]^{\aleph_0} \rightarrow \lambda$ such that $u = \{\alpha_n(u) : n < \omega\}$ (enough to define it for the countable ordinals. Then it suffices to apply F_* just once.

[[Why? Toward contradiction assume $\langle \mathcal{U}_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is strictly decreasing. So choose $\alpha_n \in \mathcal{U}_n \setminus \mathcal{U}_{n+1}$. For some infinite $w \subset \omega$, $\langle \alpha_n : n \in w \rangle$ is strictly increasing and included in some u_β . Let β be minimal such that $\alpha_n \in u_\beta$ for every $n \in w$. Let n_* be such that $n \in u_\beta \cap [n_*, \omega) \Rightarrow \alpha_n \in u_\beta$ and without loss of generality $n_* \in w$ let $n_{**} = \text{Min}(w \setminus (n_* + 1))$. Let $u = \{\alpha_n : n_{**} \leq n \in w\}$ so $u \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{n_{**}}$, $n_* \leq n_{**} - 1$ so let $\{\gamma_\ell : \ell \leq \ell(*)\}$ list $u_\beta \cap \alpha_{n_{**}}$ so clearly $\alpha_{n_*} \in \{\gamma_\ell : \ell \leq \ell(*)\}$ and we can prove by downward induction on $\ell \leq \ell(*)$ that $\gamma_\ell \in \mathcal{U}_{n_{**}}$ because $\gamma_\ell = F_*(u \cup \{\gamma_k : \ell < k \leq \ell(*)\})$, contradiction.]]

1.5 Observation. 1) If Y is an uncountable well-orderable set then the power of $\text{FIL}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y, \mu)$ is smaller or equal to the power of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(Y)) \times \mu^{|Y|}$.

2) If Y is an uncountable well-orderable set then the power of $\text{FIL}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)$ is smaller or equal to the power of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(Y))$.

Proof. Straight.

1.6 Claim. $[\text{DC}_{\aleph_0}]$ Assume

- (a) $\mathfrak{a}$ is a countable set of limit ordinals
- (b) $<_*$ is a well ordering of $\Pi \mathfrak{a}$
- (c) $\theta \in \mathfrak{a} \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\theta) \geq \theta(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$ or just $\Pi \mathfrak{a} / [\mathfrak{a}]^{<\aleph_0}$ is $\theta(\mathcal{P}(\omega))$ -directed (the implication holds as $\mathfrak{a}$ is countable).

Then we can define $(\bar{J}, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}, \bar{\mathfrak{f}})$ such that

- (α) (i) $\bar{J} = \langle J_i : i \leq i(*) \rangle$
- (ii) J_i is an ideal on $\mathfrak{a}$
- (iii) J_i is increasing continuous with i , $J_0 = \{\emptyset\}$, $J_{i(*)} = \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{a})$
- (iv) $\bar{\mathfrak{b}} = \langle \mathfrak{b}_i : i < i(*) \rangle$, $\mathfrak{b}_i \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ and $J_{i+1} = J_i + \mathfrak{b}_i$
- (β) (i) $\bar{\mathfrak{f}} = \langle \bar{f}^i : i < i(*) \rangle$
- (ii) $\bar{f}^i = \langle f_\alpha^i : \alpha < \alpha_i \rangle$

- (iii) $f_\alpha^i \in \prod \mathfrak{a}$ is $<_{J_i}$ -increasing
- (iv) $\{f_\alpha^i : \alpha < \alpha_i\}$ is cofinal in $(\prod \mathfrak{a}, <_{J_i + (\mathfrak{a} \setminus \mathfrak{b}_i)})$
- (γ) (i) $\text{cf}(\prod \mathfrak{a}) \leq \sum_{i < i(*)} \delta_i$
- (ii) for every $f \in \prod \mathfrak{a}$ for some n and finite set $\{(i_\ell, \gamma_\ell) : \ell < n\}$ such that $i_\ell < i(*)$, $\gamma_\ell < \alpha_{i_\ell}$ we have $f < \max_{\ell < n} f_{\gamma_\ell}^{i_\ell}$, i.e., $(\forall \theta \in \mathfrak{a})(\exists \ell < n)[f(\theta) < f_{\gamma_\ell}^{i_\ell}(\theta)]$.

Proof. Note that clause (γ) follows from $(\alpha) + (\beta)$.

By induction on i we try to choose $(\bar{J}^i, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}^i, \bar{\mathfrak{f}}^i)$ where $\bar{J}^i = \langle J_j : j \leq i \rangle$, $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}^i = \langle \mathfrak{b}_j^i : j < j \rangle$, $\bar{\mathfrak{f}}^i = \langle f_j^i : j < i \rangle$ which satisfies the relevant parts of the conclusion and do it uniformly from $(\mathfrak{a}, <_*)$. Once we arrive to i such that $J_i = \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{a})$ we are done.

For $i = 0$ recalling $J_0 = \{\emptyset\}$ there is no problem.

For i limit recalling that $J_i = \cup \{J_j : j < i\}$ there is no problem and note that if $j < i \Rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \notin J_j$ then $\mathfrak{a} \notin J_i$.

So assume that $(\bar{J}^i, \bar{\mathfrak{b}}^i, \bar{\mathfrak{f}}^i)$ is well defined and we shall define for $i + 1$.

We try to choose $\bar{g}^{i,\varepsilon} = \langle g_\alpha^{i,\varepsilon} : \alpha < \delta_{i,\varepsilon} \rangle$ by induction on $\varepsilon < \omega_1$ and for each ε we try to choose $g_\alpha^{i,\varepsilon} \in \prod \mathfrak{a}$ by induction on α such that

- $\otimes_{i,\varepsilon}$ (a) if $\beta < \alpha$ then $g_\beta^{i,\varepsilon} <_{J_i} g_\alpha^{i,\varepsilon}$
- (b) if $\zeta < \varepsilon$ then $g_\alpha^{i,\zeta} \leq g_\alpha^{i,\varepsilon}$
- (c) if $\text{cf}(\alpha) = \aleph_1$ then $g_\alpha^{i,\varepsilon}$ is defined by

$$\theta \in \mathfrak{a} \Rightarrow g_\alpha^{i,\varepsilon}(\theta) = \text{Min}\left\{ \bigcup_{\beta \in C} g_\beta^{i,\varepsilon}(\theta) : C \text{ is a club of } \alpha \right\}$$

- (d) if $\text{cf}(\alpha) \neq \aleph_1$, $\alpha \neq 0$ then $g_\alpha^{i,\varepsilon}$ is the $<_*$ -first $g \in \prod \mathfrak{a}$ satisfying clauses (a) + (b)
- (e) if we have $\langle g_\beta^{i,\varepsilon} : \beta < \alpha \rangle$, $\text{cf}(\alpha) > \aleph_1$ and there is no g as required in clause (d) then $\delta_{i,\varepsilon} = \alpha$
- (f) if $\alpha = 0$, the $g_\alpha^{i,\varepsilon}$ is the $<_*$ -first $g \in \prod \mathfrak{a}$ such that $\zeta < \varepsilon \Rightarrow g_\alpha^{i,\varepsilon} \leq g$ and $[\varepsilon = \zeta + 1 \Rightarrow (\forall \beta < \delta_{\varepsilon i, \varepsilon})[\neg(g \leq_{J_i} g_\beta^{i,\zeta})]]$.

The rest should be clear. $\square_{1.6}$

1.7 Remark. From 1.6 we can deduce bounds on $\theta^Y(\aleph_\delta)$ when $\delta < \aleph_0$ and more like the one on $\aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0}$ (better the bound on $\text{pp}(\aleph_\omega)$).

§2 NO DECREASING SEQUENCE OF SUBALGEBRAS

We concentrate on weaker axioms. We consider Theorem 1.2 under weaker assumptions then “ $[\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ is well orderable”. We are also interested in replacing ω by ∂ in “no decreasing ω -sequence of $\mathcal{cl}$ -closed sets”, but the reader may consider $\partial = \aleph_0$ only. Note that for the full version, Ax_α^4 , i.e., $[\alpha]^\partial$ is well orderable, case $\partial = \aleph_0$ is implied by the $\partial > \aleph_0$ version and suffices for the results. But for other versions the axioms for different ∂ 's seems incomparable.

2.1 Hypothesis. 1) DC_∂ and $\partial(*) = \partial + \aleph_1$. We fix a regular cardinal ∂ (below we can use $\text{DC}_{\aleph_0} + \text{AC}_{\partial, P(\kappa)}$ only).

2.2 Definition. Below we should write $\text{Ax}^{\ell, \partial}$ instead of Ax^ℓ .

1) $\text{Ax}_{\alpha, < \mu, \kappa}^1$ means that there is a weak closure operation on λ of character (μ, κ) , see Definition 0.12, such that there is no decreasing ∂ -sequence of $\mathcal{cl}$ -closed subsets of α .

1A) Let $\text{Ax}_{\alpha, < \mu, \kappa}^0$ mean there is $\mathcal{cl} : [\alpha]^{\leq \kappa} \rightarrow [\alpha]^{< \mu}$ such that $u \cup \{0\} \subseteq \mathcal{cl}(u)$ and there is no $\subseteq$ -decreasing sequence $\langle \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ such that $\varepsilon < \theta \Rightarrow \mathcal{cl}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon+1}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon$. If $\kappa = \partial$ we may omit it.

Writing Y instead of κ means $\mathcal{cl} : [\alpha]^{< \theta(Y)} \rightarrow [\alpha]^{< \mu}$. Let $\mathcal{cl}_{[\varepsilon]} : \mathcal{P}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$ be $\mathcal{cl}_{[\varepsilon], < \partial^+}$ as defined in 0.12(4).

2) $\text{Ax}_{\alpha, \leq \mu, \kappa}^1$ means $A_{\alpha, < \mu^+, \kappa}^1$.

3) Ax_α^2 means that there is $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\alpha]^\partial$ which is well orderable and for every $u \in [\alpha]^\partial$ for some $v \in \mathcal{A}$, $u \cap v$ has power $\geq \partial$.

4) Ax_α^3 means that $\text{cf}([\alpha]^{\leq \partial}, \subseteq)$ is below some cardinal, i.e., some cofinal $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\alpha]^\partial$ (under $\subseteq$) is well orderable.

5) Ax_α^4 means that $[\alpha]^{\leq \partial}$ is well orderable.

6) Above omitting α (or writing ∞) means “for every α ”, omitting μ we mean “ $\theta(\mathcal{P}(\partial))$ ”.

7) Lastly, let $\text{Ax}_\ell = \text{Ax}^\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2, 3$.

So easily (or we have shown in the proof of 1.2):

2.3 Claim. 1) Ax_α^4 implies Ax_α^3 , Ax_α^3 implies Ax_α^2 , Ax_α^2 implies Ax_α^1 and Ax_α^1 implies Ax_α^0 . Similarly for $\text{Ax}_{\alpha, < \mu, \kappa}^\ell$.

2) If there is a ∂ -well founded [weak] closure operation on λ of character (μ, κ) then there is a well founded [weak] closure operation of character (μ, ∂) .

3) If there is a well founded weak closure operation of character $(\mu, \aleph_0)$ on λ then there is a ∂ -well founded weak closure operation of character $(< \theta(\mathcal{H}_{< \aleph_1}(\mu)), \aleph_0)$ on λ .

- 4) In Definition 2.2(1A), if cl has monotonicity only $cl \upharpoonright [\alpha]^{\leq \partial}$ is relevant, i.e., the demand is that if $\langle \beta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle \in {}^\partial \alpha$ then for some $\varepsilon, \beta_\varepsilon \in cl\{\beta_\zeta : \zeta \in (\varepsilon, \partial)\}$.
- 5) If $Ax_{\alpha, < \mu_1}^0$ and $\partial < \theta(Y)$ and² $\mu_2 = \theta(\mu_1 \times [\mu_1]^\theta)$ then $Ax_{\alpha, < \mu_2}^{0, \theta}$.

Proof. E.g.

5) We define $cl' : [\alpha]^{< \theta(Y)} \rightarrow [\alpha]^{< \mu_2}$ by $cl'(u) = \cup\{cl(v) : v \subseteq u \text{ has cardinality } \leq \partial\}$. It is enough to note:

- (*)₁ $cl'(u)$ has cardinality $\theta(\mu_1 \times [\mu_1]^{\leq \partial})$
- (*)₂ if $\langle u_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -decreasing then $u_\varepsilon \subseteq cl'(u_{\varepsilon+1})$ for some $\varepsilon < \partial$.
 [Why? If not by AC_∂ we can choose $\langle \beta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle, \beta_\varepsilon \in u_\varepsilon \setminus cl'(u_{\varepsilon+1})$. Let $u'_\varepsilon = \{\beta_\zeta : \zeta \in [\varepsilon, \partial)\}$, and note that as u_ε is $\subseteq$ -decreasing also $cl'(u_\varepsilon)$ is $\subseteq$ -decreasing. So for some $\varepsilon, \beta_\varepsilon \in cl\{\beta_\zeta : \zeta < [\varepsilon, \partial)\}$, but this set is $\subseteq cl'(u_{\varepsilon+1})$, so we are done.] $\square_{2.3}$

2.4 Claim. Assume cl witness $Ax_{\alpha, < \mu}^0$ so $cl : [\alpha]^{\leq \partial} \rightarrow [\lambda]^{< \mu}$ and recall $cl_{[\partial+]} = cl_{[\partial+], < \partial+} : \mathcal{P}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ is from 2.2(1A), 0.12(4).

- 1) $cl_{[1]}$ is a weak closure operation, it has character (κ, μ_κ) whenever $\partial \leq \kappa \leq \lambda, \mu_\kappa = \theta(\mu \times {}^\partial \kappa)$, see definition 0.12.
- 2) $cl_{[\partial+]}$ is a closure operation, has characteristic ∂ and it has character (κ, μ'_κ) when $\partial \leq \kappa \leq \lambda$ and $\mu'_\kappa = \theta(\mathcal{H}_{< \partial+}(\mu \times \kappa))$.

Proof. 1) By the definition $cl_{[1]}$ is a weak closure operation.

Assume $u \subseteq \alpha, |u| \leq \kappa$; non-empty for simplicity. Clearly $\mu \times [u]^\partial$ has the same power $\mu \times {}^\partial \kappa$. Define the function G with domain $\mu \times [u]^\partial$ as follows: if $\alpha < \mu$ and $v \in [u]^{\leq \partial}$ then $G((\alpha, v))$ is the α -th member of $cf(v)$ if $\alpha < otp(cl(v))$ and $G((\alpha, v)) = \min(u)$ otherwise.

So G is a function from $\mu \times [u]^\partial$ onto $cl_{[1]}(u)$. This proves that $cl_{[1]}$ has character (κ, μ_κ) as $\mu_\kappa = \theta(\mu \times {}^\partial \kappa)$.

2) If $\langle \mu_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \partial^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of sets then $[u_{\partial+}]^{\leq \partial} = \cup\{[u_\varepsilon]^{\leq \partial} : \varepsilon < \partial^+\}$ as ∂^+ is regular as AC_∂ as DC_∂ .

Second, let $u \subseteq \alpha, |u| \leq \kappa$ and let $u_\varepsilon = cl_{[\varepsilon]}(u)$ for $\varepsilon \leq \partial^+$; it is enough to show that $|u_{\partial+}| < \mu'_\kappa$. The proof is similar to earlier one. $\square_{2.4}$

²can do somewhat better

2.5 Definition/Claim. Let $\mathcal{cl}$ exemplify $\text{Ax}_{\lambda, < \mu}^0$ and Y be an uncountable set of cardinality $\geq \partial(*)$.

1) Let $\mathcal{F}_\eta, \mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha}$ be as in the proof of 1.2 for $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu)$ and ordinal α (they depend on λ and $\mathcal{cl}$; so if we derive $\mathcal{cl}$ by Ax_λ^4 then they depend indirectly on the well ordering of $[\lambda]^\partial$) so we may write $\mathcal{F}_\eta(\mathcal{cl}) = \mathcal{F}_\eta(\alpha, \mathcal{cl})$, etc.

That is, fully

(*)₁ for $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu)$ and ordinal α let $\mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha}$ be the class of f such that:

- (a) f is a function from Y^η to λ
- (b) $\text{rk}_{D_1^\eta}(f) = \alpha$
- (c) $D_2^\eta = D_1^\eta \cup \{Y \setminus A : A \in J[f, D_1^\eta]\}$
- (d) $Z^\eta \in D_2^\eta$
- (e) if $Z \in D_2^\eta$ and $Z \subseteq Z^\eta$ then $\mathcal{cl}(\{f(y) : y \in Z\}) \supseteq \{f(y) : y \in Z^\eta\}$
- (f) h^η is a function with domain Z^η such that $y \in Z^\partial \Rightarrow h^\eta(y) = \text{otp}(f(y) \cap \cap \{\mathcal{cl}(\{f(z) : z \in Z\}) : Z \in D_2^\eta\})$

(*)₂ $\mathcal{F}_\eta = \cup \{\mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha} : \alpha \text{ an ordinal}\}$.

2) Let $\Xi_\eta = \Xi_\eta(\lambda, \mathcal{cl}) = \{\alpha : \mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha} \neq \emptyset\}$ and $f_{\eta, \alpha}$ is the function such that $f_{\eta, \alpha} = f \upharpoonright Z^\eta$ for every $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha}$ when $\alpha \in \Xi_\eta$; it is well defined.

3) If $D \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}(Y)$, $\text{rk}_D(f) = \alpha$ and $f \in {}^Y \lambda$ then $\alpha \in \Xi_D(\lambda, \mathcal{cl}) =: \cup \{\Xi_\eta : \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y) \text{ and } D_1^\eta = D\}$ and $f \upharpoonright Z^\eta = f_{\eta, \alpha}$ for some $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y)$.

4) If $D \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}(Y)$, $f \in {}^Y \lambda$, $\text{rk}_D(f) \geq \alpha$ then for some $g \in \prod_{y \in Y} (f(y) + 1) \subseteq {}^Y (\lambda + 1)$

we have $\text{rk}_D(g) = \alpha$ hence $\alpha \in \Xi_D(\lambda, F_*)$.

5) So we should write $\mathcal{F}_\eta[\mathcal{cl}]$, $\Xi_\eta[\lambda, \mathcal{cl}]$, $f_{\eta, \alpha}[\mathcal{cl}]$.

Proof. As in the proof of 1.2 and see the proof of 2.11.

2.6 Claim. For any $\lambda, \mathcal{cl}, \alpha, Y$ and $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu)$ if $f_{\eta, \alpha}$ is well defined then we can find $\eta' \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu)$ such that $Z^{\eta'} = Y$ and $f_{\eta', \alpha} = f_{\eta', \alpha}[\lambda, \mathcal{cl}]$ is well defined and $f_{\eta', \alpha} \upharpoonright Z^\eta = f_{\eta, \alpha}$.

Proof. Let $D_1^{\eta'} = D_1^\eta + Z^\eta$, $D_2^{\eta'} = D_2^\eta$, $Z^{\eta'} = Y$ and we define $h^{\eta'}$ by: $h^{\eta'}(y)$ is $h^\eta(y)$ if $y \in Z^\eta$ and $h^{\eta'}(y)$ is $\text{Min}[\cap \{\mathcal{cl}(\text{Rang}(f_{\eta, \alpha} \upharpoonright Z^\eta)) : Z \subseteq Z^\eta \text{ and } Z \in D_2^\eta\}]$, so zero in O.K., if $y \in Y \setminus Z^\eta$.

Now check.

□_{2.6}

2.7 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $Ax_{\xi_1, < \mu_1, Y}^0$
- (b) cl witnesses clause (a)
- (c) $D \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}(Y)$
- (d) $\xi_2 = \{\alpha : f_{\eta, \alpha}[cl] \text{ is well defined for some } \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu) \text{ which satisfies } D_1^\eta = D \text{ and necessarily } \text{Rang}(f_{\eta, \alpha}[cl]) \subseteq \xi_1\}$
- (e) μ_2 is defined as $\mu_{2,3}$ where
 - (α) let $\mu_{2,0} = \theta(Y)$
 - (β) $\mu_{2,1} = \theta(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu_1)) \times \theta(Y)$
 - (γ) $\mu_{2,2} = \Upsilon(Y(\mu_{2,1}))$
 - (δ) $\mu_{2,3} = \theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(Y)) \times {}^Y(\mu_{2,2}))$
(this is an overkill).

Then ξ_2 is an ordinal and $Ax_{\xi_2, < \mu_2, Y}^0$ (note that μ_2 is not much larger than μ_1).

Proof. To prove that ξ_2 is an ordinal we have to assume $\alpha < \beta \in \xi_2$ and prove $\alpha \in \xi_2$. As $\beta \in \xi_2$ clearly $\beta \in \Xi_\eta[cl]$ for some $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu_1)$ for which $D_1^\eta = D$ so there is $f \in {}^Y\lambda$ such that $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\eta, \beta}$. So $\text{rk}_D(f) = \text{rk}_D(f) = \beta$ hence by 0.4 there is $g \in {}^Y\lambda$ such that $g \leq f$, i.e., $(\forall y \in Y)(g(y) \leq f(y))$ and $\text{rk}_D(f) = \alpha$. By 2.5(4) there is $\eta^1 \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu)$ such that $D_1^{\eta^1} = D$ and $g \in \mathcal{F}_{\eta^1, \alpha}$ so we are done.

We define the function cl' with domain $[\xi_2]^{<\theta(Y)}$ as follows: $cl'(u) = \{\alpha : \text{there is } \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu_1) \text{ such that } f_{\eta, \alpha}[cl] \text{ is well defined}^3 \text{ and } \text{Rang}(f_{\eta, \alpha}[cl]) \subseteq cl(\mathbf{v}[u])\}$ where $\mathbf{v}[u] := \cup\{cl(v) : v \subseteq \xi_1 \text{ is of cardinality } \leq \partial \text{ and is } \subseteq \cup\{\text{Rang}(f_{\mathfrak{z}, \alpha}[cl]) : \mathfrak{z} \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu_1) \text{ and } f_{\mathfrak{z}, \alpha}[cl] \text{ is well defined}\}\}$. Note that $cl'(u) = \{\text{rk}_D(f) : D \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}(Y) \text{ and } f \in {}^Y\mathbf{v}(u)\}$.

Note:

- $\boxtimes_1$ for each $u \subseteq \xi_1$ and $\mathfrak{x} \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu_1)$ the set $\{\alpha < \xi_2 : f_{\mathfrak{x}, \alpha}[cl] \text{ is a well defined function into } u\}$ has cardinality $< \Upsilon(T_{D_2^\eta}(u))$, that is, $\langle f_{\mathfrak{x}, \alpha}[cl] : \alpha \in \Xi_{\mathfrak{x}} \cap \xi_2 \rangle$ is a sequence of functions from $Z^\mathfrak{x}$ to $u_1 \subseteq \xi_1$ any two are equal only on a set $= \emptyset \bmod D_2^\mathfrak{x}$ (with choice it is $\leq |^Y|u|$), call this bound $\mu'_{|u|}$.

³we could have used $\{t \in Y : f_{\eta, \alpha}[cl](t) \in cl(\mathbf{v}(u))\} \neq \emptyset \bmod D_2^\eta$

Note

- ⊠₂ if $u_1 \subseteq u_2 \subseteq \xi_2$ and then
 - (α) $\mathbf{v}(u_1) \subseteq \mathbf{v}(u_2) \subseteq \xi_1$
 - (β) $cl'_\varepsilon(u_1) \subseteq cl'_\varepsilon(u_2)$ for $\varepsilon \leq \partial^+$
 - (γ) if $cl'(u_1) \subset cl'(u_2)$ then $cl(\mathbf{v}(u_1)) \subset cl(\mathbf{v}(u_2))$
- ⊠₃ if $u_1 \subseteq \xi_2, |u| < \theta(Y)$ then $\{f_{\eta, \alpha}(z) : \alpha \in u, \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu_1) \text{ and } z \in Z^\eta\}$ is a subset of ξ_1 of cardinality $< \mu' := \theta(\theta(Y) \times Y \times \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y, \mu_1))$
- ⊠₄ if $u \subseteq \xi_1$ then $\cup\{cl(v) : v \in [u]^\partial\}$ has cardinality $< \theta(\mu_1 \times Y \times [u]^\partial)$
- ⊠₅ if $u \subseteq \xi_2$ and $|u| < \theta(Y)$ then $\mathbf{v}(u)$ has cardinality $< \mu'' := \theta(\mu_1 \times {}^\partial(\mu'))$
- ⊠₆ if $u \subseteq \xi_2$ and $|u| < \theta(Y)$ then $cl'(u) \subseteq \xi_2$ hence cardinality $< \mu_2 = \theta(Y)(\mu_2'')$
- ⊠₇ cl' has character $(< \mu_2, Y)$.

It is enough to prove

- ⊠₈ cl' witnessed $\text{Ax}_{\xi_2, < \mu_2, Y}^0$.

So toward contradiction assume $\bar{\mathcal{U}} = \langle \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ is $\subseteq$ -decreasing, $\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \in [\xi_1]^{< \theta(Y)}$ and $\varepsilon < \partial \Rightarrow \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \not\subseteq cl(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon)$. We define $\bar{\gamma} = \langle \gamma_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ by

$$\gamma_\varepsilon = \text{Min}(\mathcal{U}_\varepsilon \setminus cl(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon+1})).$$

As AC_∂ follows from DC_∂ , we can choose $\langle \eta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ such that $f_{\eta_\varepsilon, \gamma_\varepsilon}[cl]$ is well defined for $\varepsilon < \partial$.

We can choose $\langle z_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ such that $z_\varepsilon \in Z^{\eta_\varepsilon}$ and $\beta_\varepsilon := f_{\eta_\varepsilon, \gamma_\varepsilon}(z_\varepsilon) \notin \mathbf{v}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon+1})$. [Why? By AC_∂ it is enough to show that for each $\varepsilon < \partial$ there is such β_ε . If there is no such β_ε then $\text{Rang}(f_{\eta_\varepsilon, \gamma_\varepsilon}) \subseteq \mathbf{v}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon+1})$ which by the definition of $cl'(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon+1})$ means that $\gamma_\varepsilon \in cl'(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon+1})$.]

Let

$$u_\varepsilon = \{\beta_\zeta : \zeta \in [\varepsilon, \partial)\}.$$

So

- (*) $u_\varepsilon \in [\xi_1]^{\leq \partial} \subseteq [\xi_1]^{< \theta(Y)}$.
[Why? By the definition of $\theta(Y)$, clearly $\partial < \theta(Y)$.]
- (*) u_ε is $\subseteq$ -decreasing with ε .
[Why? By the definition.]
- (*) $\beta_\varepsilon \in \mu_\varepsilon \setminus cl(u_{\varepsilon+1})$ for $\varepsilon < \partial$.
[Why? $\beta_\varepsilon \in u_\varepsilon$ by the definition of u_ε .]

Also $u_\varepsilon \subseteq \mathbf{v}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon+1})$ by the definition of $\mathbf{v}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon+1})$.

Lastly, $\beta_\varepsilon \notin \mathbf{v}(\mathcal{U}_{\varepsilon+1})$ by the choice of β_ε . So $\langle u_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \partial \rangle$ contradict the assumption on $(\xi_1, c\ell)$.

From the above the conclusion should be clear. $\square_{2.7}$

2.8 Claim. Assume $\aleph_0 < \kappa = \text{cf}(\lambda) < \lambda$ hence κ is regular, $c\ell$ is a weak closure operation in λ of character (μ, κ) and D is the club filter on κ then

- (a) $\lambda^+ \subseteq \Xi_D(\lambda, c\ell)$ (see Definition 2.5(3))
- (b) $\|\langle \lambda_i^+ : i < \kappa \rangle\|_D = \lambda^+$ if $\lambda_i < \lambda$ for $i < \kappa$ is increasing continuous with limit λ .

Proof. You can see [Sh 497].

For each $\alpha < \lambda^+$ there is a one to one⁴ function g from α into $|\alpha| \leq \lambda$ and we let $f : \kappa \rightarrow \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ be

$$f(i) = \text{otp}(\{\beta < \alpha : f(\beta) < \lambda_i\}).$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\alpha = \{f : f \text{ is a function from } \kappa, f(i) < \lambda_i^+ \\ \text{such that for some one to one function } g \text{ from } \alpha \text{ onto } |\alpha| \\ \text{for each } i < \kappa \text{ we have } f(i) = \text{otp}(\{\beta < \alpha : f(\beta) < \lambda_i\})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now

- (*) (a) $\mathcal{F}_\alpha \neq \emptyset$
- (b) $\langle \mathcal{F}_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ exists as it is well defined
- (c) $f \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha \Rightarrow \text{rk}_D(f) = \alpha$
- (d) if $f \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ then for some $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\lambda, c\ell)$ we have $f \in \mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha}$.

[We prove clause (c) by induction on α].

Clearly we are done; of course $c\ell$ is needed only for clause (a). $\square_{2.5}$

2.9 Conclusion. 1) Assume

- (a) $\text{Ax}_{\lambda, < \mu}^0$
- (b) $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \kappa$.

⁴but, of course, possibly there is no such sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$

Then for some $\mathcal{F}_* \subseteq {}^\kappa\lambda =: \{f : f \text{ a partial function from } \kappa \text{ to } \lambda\}$ we have

- (α) every $f \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ is a countable union of members of $\mathcal{F}_*$
- (β) $\mathcal{F}_*$ is the union of $|\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa)| + \theta({}^\kappa\mu)$ well ordered sets: $\{\mathcal{F}_\eta^* : \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa, \mu)\}$
- (γ) moreover there is a function giving for each $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa)$ a well ordering of $\mathcal{F}_\eta^*$.

2) Assume in addition that $\theta(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa)) \leq \lambda$ and $\theta({}^\kappa\mu) \leq \lambda$ then for some $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa)$ we have $|\mathcal{F}_\eta| > \lambda$.

Proof. 1) By the proof of 1.2.

2) Assume that this fails, let $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ be increasing continuous with limit λ . We choose $f \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ by

$$f(i) = \text{Min}(\lambda \setminus \{f_{\eta, \alpha}(i) : \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa) \\ f_{\eta, \alpha}(i) \text{ is well defined, i.e.} \\ i \in Z[\eta] \text{ and } \alpha \in \Xi_\eta \text{ and} \\ \text{otp}(\alpha \cap \Xi_\eta) < \mu_i\}).$$

Now $f(i)$ is well defined as the minimum is taken over a non-empty set, this holds as we substruct from λ a set which as cardinality $\leq \theta(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa)) + \theta({}^\kappa\mu) + \mu_i$ which is $\leq \lambda$. $\square_{2.9}$

2.10 Conclusion. Assume $\text{Ax}_{\lambda, < \mu}^0$.

λ^+ is not measurable (which implies regular⁵) when

- $\boxtimes$ (a) $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \kappa > \aleph_0$
- (b) $\lambda \geq \theta((\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa, \mu))$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_\eta, f_{\eta, \alpha}, \mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha}^\lambda$ be defined as in 2.5 so by claim 2.5 we have $\cup\{\mathcal{F}_\eta : \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa)\} \supseteq \lambda^+$.

Let $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa, \mu)$ be such that $|\mathcal{F}_\eta| > \lambda$ it is well defined by 2.9. Let $Z = Z[\eta]$. So Ξ_η is a set of ordinals of cardinality $> \lambda$. For $\zeta < \text{otp}(\Xi_\eta)$ let α_ζ be the ζ -th

⁵the regular holds many times by 2.13

member of $\Xi_{\mathfrak{y}}$, so $f_{\mathfrak{y},\alpha_\zeta}$ is well defined. Toward contradiction let D be a (non-principal) ultrafilter on λ^+ which is λ^+ -complete. For $i \in Z$ let $\gamma_i < \lambda$ be the unique ordinal γ such that $\{\zeta < \lambda^+ : f_{\mathfrak{y},\alpha_\zeta}(i) = \gamma\} \in D$. As $|Z| \leq \kappa < \lambda^+$ and D is κ^+ -complete clearly $\{\zeta : \bigwedge_{i \in Z} f_{\mathfrak{y},\alpha_\zeta}(i) = \gamma_i\} \in D$, so as D is a non-principal ultrafilter, for some $\zeta_1 < \zeta_2$, $f_{\mathfrak{y},\alpha_{\zeta_1}} = f_{\mathfrak{y},\alpha_{\zeta_2}}$, contradiction. So there is no such D . $\square_{2.10}$

Remark. Similarly if D is κ^+ -complete and weakly λ^+ -saturated.

2.11 Claim. *If $\text{Ax}_{\lambda, < \mu, \kappa}^0$, then we can find $\bar{C}$ such that:*

- (a) $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$
- (b) $S = \{\delta < \lambda : \delta \text{ is a limit ordinal of cofinality } > \partial\}$
- (c) C_δ is an unbounded subset of δ , even a club
- (d) if $\delta \in S$, $\text{cf}(\delta) \leq \kappa$ then $|C_\delta| \leq \mu$
- (e) if $\delta \in S$, $\text{cf}(\delta) > \kappa$ then $|C_\delta| < \theta(\mu \times [\text{cf}(\delta)]^\partial)$.

Proof. The “even a club” is not serious as we can replace C_δ by its closure in δ .

Let $\mathcal{cl}$ witness $\text{Ax}_{\lambda, < \mu, \kappa}^0$. For each $\delta \in S$ with $\text{cf}(\delta) \leq \kappa$ we let

$$C_\delta = \cap \{\delta \cap \mathcal{cl}(C) : C \text{ a club of } \delta \text{ of order type } \text{cf}(\delta)\}.$$

Clearly $\bar{C}' = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \text{ and } \text{cf}(\delta) \leq \kappa \rangle$ is well defined and exist. Now clearly C_δ is a subset of δ .

For any club C of δ of order type $\text{cf}(\delta) \in [\partial, \kappa]$ clearly $\delta \cap \mathcal{cl}(C) \subseteq \mathcal{cl}(C)$ which has cardinality $< \mu$.

The main point is that C_δ is unbounded in δ , otherwise we can choose by induction on $\varepsilon < \partial$, $C_{\delta, \varepsilon}$ a club of δ of order type $\text{cf}(\delta)$, decreasing with δ such that $C_{\delta, \varepsilon} \not\subseteq \mathcal{cl}(C_{\delta, \varepsilon+1})$, we use DC_∂ . By this contradict the choice of $\mathcal{cl}$.

If $\delta < \lambda$ and $\text{cf}(\delta) > \kappa$ we let

$$C_\delta = \cap \{ \cup \{ \delta \cap \mathcal{cl}(u) : u \subseteq C \text{ has cardinality } \leq \partial \} : \\ C \text{ is a club of } \delta \text{ of order type } \text{cf}(\delta) \}.$$

Again the problem is a bound of $|C_\delta^*|$. Clearly for C a club of δ of order type $\text{cf}(\delta)$ the order-type of the set $\cup \{ \delta \cap \mathcal{cl}(v) : v \subseteq C \text{ has cardinality } \leq \partial \}$ is $< \theta(\mu \times [\text{cf}(\delta)]^\partial)$.

$\square_{2.11}$

2.12 Remark. If for $S' \subseteq S$ such that $\langle \text{otp}(C_\delta) : \delta \in S' \rangle$ is constant then we can choose $\langle C'_\delta : \delta \in S' \rangle$, C'_δ is a club of δ of order type $\text{cf}(\delta)$.

The following lemma gives the existence of a class of regular cardinals.

2.13 Lemma. *Assume*

- (a) δ is a limit ordinal $< \lambda_*$
- (b) λ_i^* is a cardinal for $i < \delta$ increasing with i
- (c) $\lambda_* = \Sigma\{\lambda_i^* : i < \delta\}$
- (d) $\lambda_{i+1}^* \geq \theta(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\lambda_i^*, \mu))$ and $\lambda_{i+1}^* \geq \theta(\mu \times {}^\partial(\lambda_i^*))$ for $i < \delta$
- (e) $\text{Ax}_{\lambda, < \mu}^0$ and $\mu < \lambda_0^*$
- (f) $\lambda = \lambda_*^+$

Then λ_*^+ is a regular cardinal.

Remark. 1) This says the successor of a strong limit singular is regular.
2) We can separate the proof of $\boxtimes_1$ to claim.

Question: 1) Is $\theta(\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(\lambda_1^*))) \geq \theta(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\lambda_i^*))$?

2) $|\text{cl}(f \upharpoonright B)| \leq \theta([B]^{< \aleph_0})$ the natural cl ?

Proof. We can replace δ by $\text{cf}(\delta)$ so without loss of generality δ is a regular cardinal.

Case 1: $\delta \leq \partial$.

So fix $\text{cl} : [\lambda]^{\leq \partial} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ a witness to $\text{Ax}_{\lambda, < \mu}^0$ and let $\langle C_\xi[\text{cl}] : \xi < \lambda, \text{cf}(\xi) \geq \partial \rangle$ be as in the proof of 2.11.

First we shall use just $\lambda > \lambda_*$, a weakening of assumption (f). Now

- $\boxtimes_1$ for every $i < \delta$ and $A \subseteq \lambda$ of cardinality $\leq \lambda_i^*$, we can find $B \subseteq \lambda$ of cardinality $\leq \lambda_{i+1}^*$ such that $(\forall \alpha \in A)[\alpha \text{ is limit} \wedge \text{cf}(\alpha) \leq \lambda_i^* \Rightarrow \alpha = \sup(\alpha \cap B)]$.

Why? By 2.11 the only problem is for $Y := \{\alpha : \alpha \in A, \alpha > \sup(A \cap \alpha), \alpha \text{ a limit ordinal of cofinality } \aleph_0\}$; so $|Y| \leq \lambda_i^*$. Note: if we were assuming Ax_λ^4 this would be immediate.

We define D_1 as the family of $A \subseteq Y$ such that

- $\otimes_1$ for some set $C \subseteq \lambda$ of $\leq \partial$ ordinals, the set $B_C =: \cup\{\text{Rang}(f_{\mathfrak{x}, \zeta}) : \mathfrak{x} \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\lambda_i^*) \text{ and } \zeta \in C \text{ or for some } \xi \in C, \text{ we have } \text{cf}(\xi) > \partial_0 \text{ and } \zeta \in C_\xi[\text{cl}]\}$ satisfies $\alpha \in Y \setminus A \Rightarrow \alpha = \sup(\alpha \cap B_C)$.

Clearly

- ⊗₂ (a) $Y \in D$
- (b) D is upward closed
- (c) D is closed under intersection of $\leq \partial$ hence of $< \partial(*)$ sets.
 [Why? If C_ε exemplifies $A_\varepsilon \in D_1$ for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(*) < \partial^+$ then $\cup\{C_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)\}$ exemplifies $A := \cap\{A_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon(*)\} \in D_1$.]
- ⊗₃ if $\emptyset \in D_1$ then we are done.
 [Why? As B_C is as required; its cardinality $\leq \lambda_{i+1}^*$ by 2.11.]

So assume $\emptyset \notin D_1$, so D is an ∂^+ -complete filter on Y . As $1 \leq |Y| \leq \lambda_i^*$, let g be a one to one function from $|Y| \leq \lambda_i^*$ onto Y and let

$$D_1 := \{B \subseteq \lambda_i^* : \{g(\alpha) : \alpha \in B \cap |Y|\} \in D\}$$

$$\zeta := \text{rk}_{D_1}(g)$$

$$D_2 := \{B \subseteq \lambda_i^* : \text{rk}_{D_1 + (\lambda_i^* \setminus B)}(g) > \zeta \text{ and } B \notin D_1 \text{ of course}\}.$$

So D_2 is an ∂^+ -complete filter on λ_i^* extending D_1 .

Let $B \in D_2$ be such that $(\forall B')[B' \in D_2 \wedge B' \subseteq B \Rightarrow \text{cl}(\text{Rang}(g \upharpoonright B')) \supseteq (\text{Rang}(g \upharpoonright B))]$. Let $\mathcal{U} = \cap\{\text{cl}(\text{Rang}(g \upharpoonright B')) : B' \in D_2\}$, so $\text{Rang}(g \upharpoonright B') \subseteq \mathcal{U}$.

Let h be the function with domain B , $\alpha \in B \Rightarrow h(\alpha) = \text{otp}(g(\alpha) \cap \mathcal{U})$.

So $\mathfrak{x} := (D_1, D_2, B, h) \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\lambda_i^*)$ and for some ζ we have $g \upharpoonright B = f_{\mathfrak{x}, \zeta}[\text{cl}]$.

Now ζ is a limit ordinal (as each $g(\alpha), \alpha < |Y|$, is) so it suffices to consider the following two subcases.

Subcase 1a: $\text{cf}(\zeta) > \partial$.

So $C_\zeta[\text{cl}]$ is well defined and let $C := \{\zeta\}$ hence $B_C = \cup\{\text{Rang}(f_{\varepsilon, \mathfrak{x}}[\text{cl}] : \varepsilon \in C_\zeta[\text{cl}]\}$ so C exemplifies that the set $A := \{\alpha \in Y : \alpha > \sup(\alpha \cap B_C)\}$ belongs to D hence $A = \{\alpha < |Y| : g(\alpha) \in A\}$ belongs to D_1 .

Now define g' , a function from λ_i^* to Ord by $g'(\alpha) = \sup(g(\alpha) \cap B_C) + 1$ if $\alpha \in A$ and $g'(\alpha) = 0$ otherwise. Clearly $g' < g \text{ mod } D_1$ hence $\text{rk}_{D_1}(g') < \zeta$, hence there is $g'', g' <_{D_1} g'' <_{D_1} g$ such that $\xi := \text{rk}_{D_1}(g'') \in C_\zeta[\text{cl}]$.

Now for some $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\lambda_i^*)$ we have $g'' = f_{\eta, \xi} \text{ mod } D_2^\eta$.

So $B =: \{\varepsilon < |Y| : g''(\varepsilon) = f_{\eta, \xi} \in D_2^\eta\}$ hence $B \in D_2^+$. So $B \cap A \in D_2^+$ but if $\varepsilon \in B \setminus A$ then $f_{\eta, \xi}(\varepsilon) \in B_C$ and $f_{\eta, \xi}(\varepsilon) \in (\sup(B_C \cap \varepsilon), \varepsilon)$.

This gives contradiction.

Subcase 1b: $\text{cf}(\zeta) \leq \partial$.

We choose a $C \subseteq \zeta$ of order type $\leq \partial$ unbounded in ζ and proceed as in subcase 1a.

As we have covered both subcases, we have proved $\boxtimes_1$. Recall we are assuming $\delta \leq \partial$ so

$\boxtimes_2$ for every $A \subseteq \lambda$ of cardinality $< \lambda_*$ we can choose $B \subseteq \lambda$ of cardinality $\leq \lambda_*$ such that $A \subseteq B$, $[\alpha + 1 \in B \Rightarrow \alpha \in B]$ and $[\alpha \in B \text{ is a limit ordinal} \wedge \text{cf}(\alpha) < \lambda_* \Rightarrow \alpha = \sup(B \cap \alpha)]$.
[Why? We choose B_i by induction on $i < \delta \leq \partial$ by $B_0 = B$, $B_{2i+1} = \{\alpha \in B_{2i} \text{ or } \alpha + 1 \in B_{2i+1}\}$ and B_{2i+2} is chosen as B was chosen in $\boxtimes_1$ for i with B_{2i+1} here in the role of A there. There is such $\langle B_i : i < \delta \rangle$ as DC_δ holds. So easily $B = \cup\{B_i : i < \delta\}$ is as required.]

Now return to our main case $\lambda = \lambda_*^+$

$\boxtimes_3$ λ_*^+ is regular.
[Why? Otherwise $\text{cf}(\lambda_*^+) < \lambda_*^+$ hence $\text{cf}(\lambda_*^+) \leq \lambda_*$, but λ_* is singular so $\text{cf}(\lambda_*^+) < \lambda_*$ hence there is a set A of cardinality $\text{cf}(\lambda_*^+) < \lambda_*$ such that $A \subseteq \lambda_*^+ = \sup(A)$. Now choose B as in $\boxtimes_2$. So $|B| \leq \lambda_*$, B is an unbounded subset of λ_*^+ , $\alpha + 1 \in B \Rightarrow \alpha \in B$ and if $\delta \in B$ is a limit ordinal then $\text{cf}(\delta) \leq |\delta| \leq \lambda_*$, but $\text{cf}(\delta)$ is regular so $\text{cf}(\delta) < \lambda_*$ hence $\delta = \sup(B \cap \delta)$. But this trivially implies that $B = \lambda_*^+$, but $|B| \leq \lambda_*$, contradiction.]

Case 2: $\text{cf}(\delta) > \partial$.

By claim 2.15 below.

$\square_{2.13}$

2.14 Remark. Of course, if we assume Ax_λ^4 then the proof of 2.13 is much simpler: if $<_*$ is a well ordering of $[\lambda]^{\leq \partial}$ for $\delta < \lambda$ of cofinality $\leq \partial$ let $C_\delta =$ the $<_*$ -first closed unbounded subset of δ of order type $\text{cf}(\delta)$.

2.15 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of cardinals $> \kappa$
- (b) $\lambda_\kappa = \Sigma\{\lambda_i : i < \kappa\}$
- (c) $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > \partial$
- (d) $\text{Ax}_{\lambda, < \mu, \kappa}^0$
- (e) $\theta(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa, \mu)) < \lambda, \mu < \lambda_0$
- (f) $S := \{i < \kappa : \lambda_i^+ \text{ is a regular cardinal}\}$ is a stationary subset of κ .

Then λ_κ^+ is a regular cardinal.

Proof. Recall 2.8 which we shall use. Let $D = D_\kappa + S$ where D_κ is the club filter on κ . Toward contradiction assume that $\text{cf}(\lambda_\kappa^+) < \lambda_\kappa^+$ hence $\text{cf}(\lambda_\kappa^+) \leq \lambda_\kappa$, but λ_κ is singular hence for some $i(*) < \kappa$, $\text{cf}(\lambda_\kappa^+) \leq \lambda_{i(*)}$. Let $c\ell$ witness $\text{Ax}_{\lambda, < \mu, \kappa}^0$.

Let B be an unbounded subset of λ_κ^+ of order type $\text{cf}(\lambda_\kappa^+) < \lambda_{i(*)}$. By renaming without loss of generality $i(*) = 0$. Let

$$\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \cup \{ \text{Rang}(f_{\eta, \alpha}) : f_{\eta, \alpha}[c\ell] \text{ is well defined and } \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa) \text{ and } D_1^\eta = D_\kappa + S \}.$$

So $|\mathcal{U}_\alpha| \leq \theta(Y \times \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa, \mu)) = \theta(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa, \mu))$, even $<$. Let $\mathcal{U} = \cup \{ \mathcal{U}_\alpha : \alpha \in B \}$ so $|\mathcal{U}| \leq \theta(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa, \mu)) + |B|$.

We define $f \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i^+$ by

$$(\alpha) \quad f(i) \text{ is: } \begin{array}{ll} \sup(\mathcal{U} \cap \lambda_i^+) & \text{if } \text{cf}(\lambda_i^+) > |\mathcal{U}| \\ \text{zero} & \text{otherwise.} \end{array}$$

So

$$(\beta) \quad f \in \prod_{i < \partial} \lambda_i^+ \text{ hence } \text{rk}_{D+S}(f) < \lambda_\kappa^+ \text{ by 2.8.}$$

Clearly

$$(\gamma) \quad \{i < \kappa : f(i) = 0\} = \emptyset \text{ mod } D \text{ and let } \alpha(*) = \text{rk}_D(f), \text{ so for some } \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(\kappa), D_1^\eta = D \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha}, \text{ hence } f_{\eta, \alpha}(i) \in \mathcal{U} \cap \lambda_i^+ \text{ for even } i \in Z^\eta,$$

hence we get easy contradiction. □_{2.15}

2.16 Claim. Assume(a)-(e) from 2.15.

1) If θ a cardinal $< \lambda$ and $S := \{i < \kappa : \text{cf}(\lambda_i^+) > \theta\}$ is a stationary subset of κ then $\text{cf}(\lambda_\kappa^+) > \theta$.

2) If AC_κ and $S \subseteq \kappa$ is stationary then $\text{cf}(\lambda_\kappa^+) < \theta(\prod_{i \in S} \text{cf}(\lambda_i^+))$.

Proof. 1) Like 2.15.

2) By AC_κ we can choose $\bar{B} = \langle B_i : i \in S \rangle$, B_i a club of λ_i^+ and $\text{otp}(B_i) = \text{cf}(\lambda_i^+)$

and let $B_i = \{0\}$ for $i \in \kappa \setminus S$. Let $B = \text{rk}_{D+S}(f) : f \in \prod_{i \in S} B_i$ is an unbounded in λ^+ , so $f \mapsto \text{rk}_{D+S}(f)$ exemplify $\theta(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i) > \text{cf}(\lambda_\kappa^+)$, but trivially $\theta(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i) = (\prod_{i \in S} B_i)^+$ so we are done. $\square_{2.16}$

Implicit above is

2.17 Claim. Assume cl witness $\text{Ax}_{\alpha, < \mu}^0$. The ordinals $\gamma_\ell, \ell = 0, 1, 2$ are nearly equal see $\circledast$ below where

- $\boxtimes$ (a) $\gamma_0 = \theta(Y \alpha)$, a cardinal
- (b) $\gamma_1 = \cup \{\|\alpha\|_D : D \in \text{Fil}_\partial(Y)\}$
- (c) $\gamma_2 = \sup\{\text{otp}(\Xi_\eta[\text{cl}] + 1 : \eta \in \text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y))\}$
- $\circledast$ (α) $\gamma_2 \leq \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_0$
- (β) γ_0 is the union of $\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y)$ sets each of order type $< \gamma_2$
- (γ) γ_0 is the disjoint union of $< \theta(\mathcal{P}(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y)))$ sets each of order type $< \gamma_2$
- (δ) if $\gamma_0 > \theta(\mathcal{P}(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y)))$ and $\gamma_0 \geq |\gamma_0|^+$ then $|\gamma_0| \leq |\gamma_2|^{++}$ and $\text{cf}(|\gamma_2|^+) < \theta(\mathcal{P}(\text{Fil}_{\partial(*)}^4(Y)))$.

Proof. Straight.

GLOSSARY

§0 Introduction

Theorem 0.1: a main result of [Sh 497]: [DC] if $\mathcal{H}(\mu)$ is well ordered, μ strong limit singular of uncountable cofinality then μ^+ is a regular non-measurable $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ well ordered and $\lambda \in (\mu, 2^\mu)$ is measurable.

Theorem 0.2: Assume DC + AC $_\kappa$ + “ κ regular uncountable, $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ increasing continuous μ strong limit. Then for at most one θ the set $\{i : \text{cf}(\mu_i^+) = \theta\}$.”

Definition 0.3: $\theta(A), \Upsilon(\theta)$

Definition 0.4: $\text{rk}_D(f), D$ and $\aleph_1$ -complete filter on Y

Claim 0.5: [DC], $\text{rk}_D(f)$ an ordinal

Claim 0.6: [DC] $\text{rk}_D(f) = \text{Min}\{\text{rk}_{D+Y_n}(f) : Y_n \in D^+\}$ if $\langle Y_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is a partition of $Y = \text{Dom } D$

Definition 0.7: $J[f, D] = \{Z \subseteq Y : Y \setminus Z \in D \text{ or } \text{rk}_{D+(Y \setminus Z)}(f) > \text{rk}_D(f)\}$.

Claim 0.8: [DC + AC $_{<\kappa}$]: 1) If D is a κ -complete filter on $Y, \kappa > \aleph_0, f \in {}^Y \text{Ord}$ then $J[f, D]$ is a κ -complete filter on Y .

2) Uniqueness

Definition 0.9: $\mathcal{H}_{<\kappa, \gamma>}(Y)$

Observation 0.10: 1) If λ is the disjoint union of $\langle W_z : z \in Z \rangle, z \in Z \Rightarrow |W_z| < \lambda$ and $\Upsilon(Z) \leq \lambda$ then $\lambda = \sup\{\text{otp}(W_z) : z \in Z\}$ hence $\text{cf}(\lambda) < \theta(Z)$.

2) If $\lambda = \cup\{W_z : z \in Z\}$ and $\Upsilon(\mathcal{P}(Z)) \leq \lambda$ then $\lambda = \sup\{\text{otp}(W_z) : z \in Z\}$.

Definition 0.11: $\text{NFil}(\mathcal{Y}, \iota)$, the ι -normal filter on $\mathcal{Y}$

Definition 0.12: 1) $\mathcal{cl}$ is a closure operation on λ of character (μ, κ) .

2) λ is f -inaccessible

3) $\mathcal{cl} : \mathcal{P}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\lambda)$ is well founded

4) $\mathcal{cl}_{<\kappa}^{[\varepsilon]} = \mathcal{cl}_{[\varepsilon], <\kappa}$

5) $\mathcal{cl}_*^\varepsilon(u, F)$

6) $\mathcal{cl}_*(u, F) = \mathcal{cl}_*^{\omega_1}(u, F)$

§1 Representing ${}^\kappa \lambda$

Definition 1.1: 1) $\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^\ell(Y)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, e.g. and $\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^\ell(Y, \mu)$ for $\ell = 3, 4$, e.g. for $\ell = 4$ it is the set of $\mathfrak{y} = (D_1, D_1, h, Z), D_1 \subseteq D_2$ are filters on $Y, Z \in D_2$ and $h : Y \rightarrow \mu\}$

Theorem 1.2: [DC $_{\aleph_0}$ + $[\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ well ordered, Y uncountable. We can find a set $\langle \mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{y} : \mathfrak{y} \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y) \rangle$ of well ordered sets such that every $f \in {}^Y \lambda$ is the union of countable many functions from $\cup\{\mathcal{F}_\mathfrak{y} : \mathfrak{y} \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4[Y]\}$

Theorem 1.3: $[DC + {}^\omega\alpha$ is well ordered for every $\alpha]$ For any set Y and ordinal α a sequence of few (i.e., set of indexed determined by Y only) well ordered sets.

Remark 1.4: Replacing $[\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ by $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ dense enough and other improvement of the theorems

Observation 1.5: Bounding the power of $\text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)$

Claim 1.6: A pcf theorem for Π_a

§2 No decreasing sequence of subalgebras

Hypothesis 2.1: DC_∂

Definition 2.2: We define various weaker versions of “ $[\alpha]^{\aleph_0}$ is well ordered” for every ordinal α

Claim 2.3: Summing up implications among those axioms and properties (prove inside 1.2)

Definition 2.4: If the operation cl witness $Ax_{\lambda, \leq \mu}^1$

Definition/Claim 2.5: Let cl exemplifying $Ax_{\lambda, < \mu}^1$ and Y be uncountable.

- 1) $\mathcal{F}_\eta, \mathcal{F}_{\partial, \alpha}$ as in the proof of 1.2.
- 2) $\Xi_\eta = \{\alpha : \mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha} \neq \emptyset\}, f_{\eta, \alpha} = f \upharpoonright Z^\eta$ when $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\eta, \alpha}$.
- 3) If $D_1 \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}(Y), f \in {}^Y X$ and $\text{rk}_{D_1}(f) = \alpha$ then $f_{\eta, \alpha} = f \upharpoonright Z^\eta$ for some $\eta \in \text{Fil}_{\aleph_1}^4(Y)$ so $d \in \Xi_\eta$ and $D_1^\eta = D$.
- 4) If $f \in {}^Y \lambda, \text{rk}_D(f) \geq \alpha$ then for some $g \in \prod_{y \in Y} (f(y) + 1), \text{rk}_D(g) = \alpha$.

Claim 2.6: If $f_{\eta, \alpha}$ is well defined then we can find $f' \subseteq f$ and ∂' such that $f' = f_{\eta', \alpha}, Z^{\eta'} = Y$.

Claim 2.7: $Ax_{\xi, < \mu}^1$ to $Ax_{\xi, < \mu'}^1$

Claim 2.8: $\lambda^+ \subseteq \Xi_{D(\lambda, F_*)}$ under reasonable conditions

Conclusion 2.9: Repeat 1.2 for $Ax_{\lambda, < \mu}^1$

Conclusion 2.10: sufficient conditions for λ^+ is not measurable

Claim 2.11: sufficient conditions for the choice of $\langle C_\delta : \delta < \lambda, \text{cf}(\delta) > \aleph_1 \rangle, C_\delta$ a not too large club of δ

Remark 2.12: improving to $\langle \text{otp}(C_\delta) \rangle$ constant for $\delta \in S'$

Lemma 2.13: $[DC + Ax_\mu^1]$ If λ is strong limit singular then λ^+ is regular

Remark 2.14: If Ax_λ^4

Claim 2.15: If $\lambda_i (i \leq \kappa)$ is increasing continuous $> \kappa, \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > \aleph_\kappa$ and for stationarily many i, λ_i^+ is regular then λ_κ^+ is regular

Claim 2.16: 1) In 2.15, if $\{i < \kappa : \text{cf}(\lambda_i^+) > \theta\}$ is a stationary subset of κ then $\text{cf}(\lambda_\kappa^+) > \theta$.

2) If AC_κ and $S \subseteq \kappa$ is stationary then $\text{cf}(\lambda_\kappa^+) < \theta(\prod_{i < \kappa} \text{cf}(\lambda_i^+))$.

Claim 2.17: Three measures of ${}^Y\alpha$ are nearly equal.

REFERENCES.

- [ApMg95] Arthur Apter and Menahem Magidor. Instances of Dependent Choice and the Measurability of $\aleph_{\omega+1}$. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **74**:203–219, 1995.
- [DJ2] Tony Dodd and Ronald B. Jensen. The covering lemma for K . *Ann. of Math Logic*, **22**:1–30, 1982.
- [ES] William B. Easton. Powers of regular cardinals. *Annals of Math. Logic*, **1**:139–178, 1970.
- [GH75] Fred Galvin and Andras Hajnal. Inequalities for cardinal powers. *Annals of Mathematics*, **101**:491–498, 1975.
- [Sh:F728] Saharon Shelah. A PCF try.
- [Sh:F725] Saharon Shelah. More PCF without choice.
- [Sh 71] Saharon Shelah. A note on cardinal exponentiation. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **45**:56–66, 1980.
- [Sh:g] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh 497] Saharon Shelah. Set Theory without choice: not everything on cofinality is possible. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **36**:81–125, 1997. A special volume dedicated to Prof. Azriel Levy. math.LO/9512227.
- [Sh 589] Saharon Shelah. Applications of PCF theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **65**:1624–1674, 2000.
- [Sh 460] Saharon Shelah. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **116**:285–321, 2000. math.LO/9809200.
- [Sh:E37] Shelah, Saharon. What majority decisions are possible. math.CO/0303323.